

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/630,341	07/30/2003		Bruce A. Dillman	263 P 026	9302	
26952	7590	08/22/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ROGER H.	J 1 – 11 ·	VF.	HWU, D.	HWU, DAVIS D		
53RD FLOC		. 2	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CHICAGO,	IL 60600	6-6622	3752			

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/630,341	DILLMAN, BRU	JCE A.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
English States	Davis D. Hwu	3752	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover she	et with the correspondence	address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, m within the statutory minimum ill apply and will expire SIX (6) cause the application to becon	hay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered tin MONTHS from the mailing date of this me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mely. is communication.
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 Ju	lv 2005.		
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ce except for formal	matters, prosecution as to	the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935	C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4)	vn from consideration		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 12. **The oath of the correction of the oath oath of the oath oath oath oath oath oath oath oath	epted or b) objected drawing(s) be held in ab on is required if the draw	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). wing(s) is objected to. See 37	CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received ity documents have b (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	in Application No een received in this Nation	al Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper 5) Notice	iew Summary (PTO-413) · No(s)/Mail Date e of Informal Patent Application (P	°TO-152)
J.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Act	tion Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail	I Date 20050815

Art Unit: 3752

Response to Amendment

- 1. Applicant's amendment and remarks of July 11, 2005 are entered and have been fully considered.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 4 objected to because of the following informalities: it is dependent on a cancelled claim. Appropriate correction is required. Claim 4 will be treated as being dependent on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 1, 9, 12, 14, 15, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulsen.

Poulsen discloses a method for subduing a fire comprising the steps of moving a vehicle supporting a jet engine to a location in front of the fire, operating a jet turbine to draw surrounding ambient air to form an exhaust, directing the exhaust in a desired direction to fight the fire, and forcing fire retardant under pressure into the exhaust of the turbine from a separate retardant supply tank 19. Since the turbine of Poulsen is pivotally mounted on a horizontal axis in order to aim the turbine, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the exhaust can be directed directly at or in front of the front wall of the flames and not above the fire if so desired by an operator. Poulsen discloses using a liquid fire retardant however, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that inert

Art Unit: 3752

particulate can be used in place of the liquid and that various fire fighting particulates are known to be environment friendly such as sandstone and limestone powders for example. The vehicle and jet engine will be counterbalanced the combination of the vehicle brakes and by mounting the jet engine to a base plate 52 via the bolts 55 in which the engine is adjustably mounted and can be mounted to the bed of a truck. Regarding the plurality of the fuel tanks and pumps as recited in claim 25, it has been that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

- 5. Claims 4-6, 13, 16, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulsen in view of Cottrell et al.
- Cottrell et al. teach solid fire extinguishing compositions comprising sand or limestone dust which are effective in extinguishing fires. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used sand or limestone dust as a fire retardant in the device of Poulsen as taught by Cottrell et al. to effectively fight various fires.
- 6. Claims 7, 8, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulsen in view of McBride.

McBride teaches a fire fighting method in which either or both water and a second retardant are used to douse the fire. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used either or both water and a second retardant to douse the fire as taught by McBride for effectively subduing the fire.

Application/Control Number: 10/630,341

Art Unit: 3752

7. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poulsen.

Page 4

Since the supply of retardant is pressurized, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art to use a compressor to pressurize the retardant to force the

retardant through the conduit.

8. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Poulsen in view of Relyea et al.

Relyea et al. teach a fire fighting vehicle comprising a moveable crane boom affixed to a

vehicle and a rotatable nozzle 24 attached to the crane. It would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have placed

the nozzle of Poulsen on a crane boom as taught by Relyea et al. to raise the nozzle to

required heights to fight fires.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed July 11, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Poulsen discloses aiming the exhaust above the fire as argued by the applicant as one preferred embodiment, however, this limitation does not preclude an operator from directing the exhaust directly at or in front of the front wall of the flames of the fire since the jet engine is pivotable to direct water or other fire retardant at the fire as desired by an operator. One having ordinary skill in the art would know that in cases of tunnel fires for example, an operator would direct the exhaust directly in front of the fire. Cottrell et al. teaches using limestone dust or fine sand as fire retardants as claimed by the instant invention. Applicant has not claimed using any of the claimed

particulates alone, so therefore, any particulate comprising limestone dust or fine sand

Application/Control Number: 10/630,341 Page 5

Art Unit: 3752

meets the claimed limitations regardless of whether they are used alone or mixed with another material.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire-THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Davis D. Hwu whose telephone number is 571-272-4904. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on 571-272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval

(PAIR) system.

Davis Hwu

DAVIS HWU PRIMARY EXAMINER